

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
MARTINSBURG**

**DONALD J. GOLES,**

Plaintiff,

**v.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12-CV-136  
(JUDGE GROH)**

**CAROLYN W. COLVIN,  
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,**

Defendant.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge David J. Joel. By Local Rule, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Joel for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R & R"). Magistrate Judge Joel filed his R & R on May 16, 2013 [Doc. 19]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court affirm the decision of the Administrative Law Judge and dismiss the plaintiff's Complaint.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1); ***Snyder v.***


**Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Joel's R & R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the report and recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation **[Doc. 19]** should be, and hereby is, **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. As such, the plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment **[Doc. 14]** is **DENIED**, and the defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment **[Doc. 17]** is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, this Court hereby **DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE** the plaintiff's Complaint **[Doc. 1]**, and this matter is **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to all counsel of record and/or *pro se* parties.

**DATED:** September 5, 2013.

  
GINA M. GROH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE